



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17575 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 778-6480 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

RDCS WORKSHOP

DECEMBER 8, 2009

PRESENT: Tanda, Mueller, Escobar, Hart, Koepp-Baker, Liegl, Moniz

Senior Planner Tolentino called the workshop to order at 6:00 pm.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss global scoring issues and procedures for conducting the Residential Development Control System public hearings, and to request policy direction regarding the multi-family rental competition category.

The workshop adjourned at 6:50 pm.

REGULAR MEETING

DECEMBER 8, 2009

PRESENT: Tanda, Mueller, Escobar, Hart, Koepp-Baker, Liegl, Moniz

ABSENT: None

LATE: None

STAFF: Senior Planner (SP) Tolentino, Senior Engineer (SE) Creer, and
Development Services Technician Bassett

Chair Tanda called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., inviting all present to join in reciting the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Development Services Technician Bassett certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Tanda opened, and then closed, the floor to public comment for matters not appearing on the agenda as none were in attendance indicating a wish to address such matters.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 2

MINUTES:

October 20, 2009 **COMMISSIONERS MUELLER AND MONIZ MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 20, 2009 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:**

Page 8, paragraph 2 **COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/ESCOBAR MOTIONED to NOT delete Section 18.24.080(C) of the CC-R district; instead to add language to state that only one detached dwelling unit per parcel is allowed, except that one secondary dwelling of ___ size is allowed on a ___ size lot (staff to propose appropriate numbers for blanks one secondary dwelling unit of up to six hundred forty square feet on a lot size of 3,000 square feet is allowed consistent with Chapter 18.55.**

THE MOTION PASSED (7-0-0-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: UNANIMOUS; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

October 27, 2009 **COMMISSIONERS MUELLER AND MONIZ MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 27, 2009 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS: NONE**

**THE MOTION PASSED (6-0-1-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: TANDA, MUELLER, HART, KOEP-BAKER, LIEGL, MONIZ
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: ESCOBAR
ABSENT: NONE**

CONSENT:

1) EXTENSION OF TIME, EOT-09-09(UP-08-11): BARRETT-COLSON & COLSON

The applicant is requesting approval of a two-year extension of time to commence the operation of a congregate care retirement residence near the northwest corner of Barrett Avenue and Butterfield Boulevard, extending the deadline from February 5, 2010 to February 5, 2012.

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER AND ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE EXTENSION OF TIME

THE MOTION PASSED (7-0-0-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: UNANIMOUS; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2) USE PERMIT, UP-09-07: MADRONE-ANYTIME FITNESS:

A request for approval of a conditional use permit to operate a 3,940-sf fitness center in the Madrone Village Shopping Center. The shopping center is located at the northwest corner of Cochrane Rd. and Madrone Parkway in a PUD, Planned Unit Development, zoning district. The fitness center is proposed to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. (APN 726-33-031)

Senior Planner Tolentino presented her staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 08, 2009
PAGE 3

Chair Tanda opened the floor to public comment and questions.

Brad Krouskup of TBI, owner of the Madrone Village Shopping Center, took the floor to answer questions regarding the shopping center. They are pleased to have Anytime Fitness as a tenant.

Koepp-Baker: Are you concerned with a non-manned facility at night?

Krouskup: No, there will be security cards and cameras. The facility will be secure and well-lit. It should enhance the safety of the center having people on-site at all hours of the day. They are looking forward to it as enhanced security.

Mueller: How large is this franchise?

Krouskup: There are over 1,200 franchises across the country. It is one of the more successful and quickly growing franchises. TBI is impressed with their success rate, with over 95% of the franchises operating successful businesses.

Tanda: Since this is a facility where people exercise, what concern is there for people's medical safety if there is no one on staff after-hours?

Tolentino: There will be emergency buttons on a chain to press if the person feels light headed or ill. There will also be emergency buttons on the walls.

Garrison Ramoso (co-owner of the proposed facility): There is an ADD device for such issues, and as mentioned, the emergency buttons on the walls to push.

Mueller: Are people watching (on security surveillance cameras) 100 percent of the day?

Ramoso: No.

Mueller: What if something happens really quick? And, are there free weights?

Ramoso: Yes, there are free weights.

Megan Ramoso (co-owner of the facility): For the safety of the members, there will be a sign that during unstaffed hours it is suggested that they wear the emergency buttons around their necks. Also, the red buttons on the wall go straight to 9-1-1.

G. Ramoso: Regarding the track record of the franchise, I am not aware of any deaths that have occurred. There have been emergencies, but no deaths that I am aware of. That is why the emergency buttons are provided.

Koepp-Baker: Regarding the surveillance camera, can you, as the owner, view the activity in the gym?

G. Ramoso: Yes, it is a full panorama of the gym.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 4

Tanda: Is this something that would be appropriate for the Fire Department to review?

Tolentino: The Fire Department has reviewed the project and provided comments as part of the routine Development Review Committee (DRC) process.

With no further questions, Tanda closed the public hearing.

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER AND ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE USE PERMIT FOR ANYTIME FITNESS

THE MOTION PASSED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: UNANIMOUS; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

**OTHER
BUSINESS:**

**3) RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL
SYSTEMS(RDCS)
PUBLIC
HEARINGS FOR
THE 2009-10
COMPETITIONS:**

APPLICANTS FOR THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS HAVE REQUESTED A BUILDING ALLOTMENT UNDER THE CITY'S RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM, PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 18.78 OF THE MORGAN HILL MUNICIPAL CODE

Tanda: Rebecca, could you please give a brief summary of RDCS?

Tolentino: RDCS is a competition that provides for residential controlled growth. There are 15 categories in which points can be gained. The most successful of the projects to compete will be awarded the allotments.

**a)MEASURE C,
MC-09-02:
E. DUNNE-
MENDOZA:**

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The 8-unit mixed use project is proposed on a .58 acre site located on the south side of E. Dunne Ave. 115 ft. east of the Monterey Rd. and Dunne Ave. intersection. (APN 817-01-031)

Tolentino presented her staff report.

Tanda then opened the floor to Bill McClintock of MH Engineering, who represents the applicant.

McClintock: This project is an 8-unit condo project on E. Dunne Avenue at the sight of the old St. Catherine's Hall. Seven (7) market rate units and one (1) BMR have been proposed. That is a high number of BMRs for the total number of units. The applicant has opted to sell the unit. The project has been beautifully designed. It is close to downtown. It is, in effect, a downtown project. It has been proposed as a remodel in the past. It is a blighted site. This project will demo the site and start over. This is a good thing, and a superior project with a lot of benefits to the community.

McClintock: We would like extra points in the historical building category, if this is a historical building.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 5

Tanda: Does this need to go through the historical building review process?

Tolentino: It already has, and it's not historical.

Koepp-Baker: What about traffic on that corner?

McClintock: There will be a full street with a parking lane in front of the building. There shouldn't be a problem with parking. In the future, widening Dunne Avenue all the way to Church Street would be beneficial.

With no more public comment, Tanda turned the discussion over to the Commission.

Mueller: I don't think the Livable Communities criteria for downtown area projects apply because there is no downtown set-aside. There is a CL-R and CC-R, but not a downtown set-aside. It begs the question if the Mendoza project is eligible for points as a downtown area project.

Tolentino: We will need consensus from the Commission regarding how to consider this project.

Tanda: We will have to clarify that issue.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION FOR STAFF TO RE-EVALUATE WHETHER OR NOT THE MENDOZA PROJECT IS ELIGIBLE FOR POINTS AS A DOWNTOWN AREA PROJECT.]

Moniz: What about "acute angles?" [referring to the Lot Layout & Orientation Category]. Since this is a single-lot project with no change to the existing dimensions, it's true that no acute angles are being created. For one-lot projects does this measure *[avoids excessive use of sharp angled lots]* not apply? What is the history with similar applications?

Tolentino: Historically, points have been awarded for projects involving only a single lot. *[Upon further review it was determined by staff that historically points have NOT been awarded under this criterion for projects involving only a single lot.]*

With no more questions, Tanda moved on to the second project.

b)MEASURE C, **MC-09-03:** **CAMPOLI-E & H:**

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 12-unit single-family home project is located on a 2.3 acre site on the west side of Old Monterey Rd. 85 ft. north of the intersection of Paloma Dr. and Old Monterey Rd. (APN 764-24-010)

Tolentino presented her staff report.

Tanda opened the floor to public comment and welcomed Vince Burgos of Development Process Consultants to the floor.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 6

Burgos: On this project, there were 3 Housing Types provided. The report only reflects two. The plans provide for single family detached, single family attached and granny units. Plan 3 would have 6 units, all with granny units. The report should be adjusted to reflect that. The project should be awarded three points under this category.

Mueller: Is that shown in the narrative?

Burgos: Yes, and I was under the impression that the issue had already been settled, but we can come back to that.

McClintock: We have submitted a letter to the Commissioners asking for one additional point in circulation efficiency, and another point for eliminating a stub at Bonita Way and completing the street on Old Monterey to a full standard street all the way from Paloma Drive north to Campoli Drive. We would like two points altogether. It is contained in the narrative on page 51, criteria 1E and also in criteria 3 at the top of page 54. It is also shown on the plans.

Koepp-Baker: So you're asking for two points but the City only gave you one?

McClintock: Correct.

Mueller: There are two other points where there might be a problem. Under the schools category, I don't think there's a safe walking path to either Britton or Sobrato. There's no sidewalk.

McClintock: We didn't get those points.

Mueller: Yes you did, and a dirt path does not count as a safe walking path. Otherwise, people would be getting points all the way to Live Oak, but they can't because there is no sidewalk. Staff will need to revisit that and possibly deduct a point. Under Page 10, criteria 1C and 1D, if the project didn't commit to a sidewalk, then there's no safe walking path.

Tanda closed the floor to public comment and brought the discussion back to the Commission.

Koepp-Baker: So we're looking at a potential change of three points?

Liegl: We'll figure that out at scoring time.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION FOR STAFF TO RE-EVALUATE THE FOLLOWING: NUMBER OF HOUSING TYPES, SAFE WALKING ROUTE TO BRITTON AND SOBRATO SCHOOLS AND CIRCULATION EFFICIENCY COMMITMENT TO IMPROVE OLD MONTEREY RD.]

Tanda then closed the discussion and moved on to Item 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 7

c) MEASURE C,
MC-09-04:
COCHRANE-
BORELLO:

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 245-unit single family home project is proposed on a 120 acre site located between Peet Rd., Cochrane Rd. and Half Rd. (APN 728-34-009)

Tolentino presented her staff report.

Tanda opened the floor to public comment.

Vince Burgos appeared to answer questions for the applicant.

Mueller: The Master Plan Development application should provide all the details for the whole project. Why do we not have a complete Master Plan for this project?

Burgos: We did file a Master Plan for the Planned Development.

Mueller: We did not get all those details.

Vince: It was a very tight application between filing time and now. There was not enough time to file a Final Map, so it could not be treated as an ongoing project. One issue was storm retention. This is ultimately 245 lots. However, we did make commitments to a certain percentage of BMR's and certain setbacks.

Mueller: I expect to see a Master Plan Development for the whole project.

Koepp-Baker: Has the reasoning changed regarding wells?

Creer: I'm not sure the reasoning has changed, but the ability to provide wells in that location is difficult.

Koepp-Baker: How many houses do we project to put on that end of town in the next five years?

Tolentino: I cannot provide that information off the top of my head at this moment.

Koepp-Baker: Given that we have a future elementary school in that area, are we being open- minded to opening a well and capping it for future use?

Creer: I'm not an expert, but it is a very rigorous process with the state to drill a municipal well. Also, the cost to drill a municipal well can exceed 200K.

Tanda: Would you like staff to bring anything to the next meeting?

Koepp-Baker: No, I don't think they can, but I think we're maybe being close-minded about future wells.

Chair Tanda called for a ten minute break at 8:00 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 8:10 pm.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 8

d) MEASURE C,
MC-09-05:
MONTEREY-
LIQU:

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 38-unit multi-family mixed use project is proposed on a 2.9 acre site located on the west side of Monterey Rd., 300 ft. north of the intersection of Cosmo Ave. and Monterey Rd. (APN 767-17-046)

Tolentino presented her report.

Tolentino: Staff does have a point adjustment under the schools category. It shows 17 points. They should get an additional 6 for a total of 23 under Schools. Also, staff will need to rescore Parks and Paths to give credit for the two, picnic/barbecue areas proposed.

Tanda opened the floor to public comment and invited Bill McClintock of MH Engineering to speak.

McClintock: We would like to address the 2 point criteria on page 68 regarding Natural and Environmental. Staff contends that the project does not conform to the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams. This is not specific enough to know what they're not in conformance with. MH has been doing projects on Little Llagas Creek for a long time. We have designed grading in conformance with the standards including a 14 ft wide travel way and a gentle slope downward. I believe there aren't any criteria we're not in conformance with. We want to minimize the number of outfall structures going into the creek. We have been sensitive to that and are using an existing structure. We therefore respectfully request the 2 points.

Tolentino: I'm not familiar with the specific standards contained in the Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams. I will need to consult with the Staff person that scored this criterion and reevaluate.

Mueller: Under the Safety and Security category, I don't believe points were historically given for fire sprinklers in multi-family projects.

Tolentino: Actually, a category was created to allow for multi-family projects to be awarded points for fire sprinklers.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION FOR STAFF TO RE-EVALUATE CRITERION 2a UNDER NATURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGARDING CONFORMANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR LAND USE NEAR STREAMS.]

With no further comments, Tanda closed the discussion and moved on to the next project.

e) MEASURE C,
MC-09-06:
MONTEREY-
DYNASTY:

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 129 unit project is located on a 7.3 acre site on the west side of Monterey Rd., 780 ft. north of the Watsonville Rd. and Monterey Rd. intersection. (APN 767-23-026 & 029)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 9

Tolentino presented her staff report and added that the project should be given 21 points instead of 19 points under the Schools Category and should be reviewed for the two, picnic/barbecue area amenities proposed under the Parks & Paths Category.

Vince Burgos appeared on behalf of the project.

Burgos: Regarding the amenities, we did show a number of amenities on the plan last year. One was a swimming pool. This year pools were eliminated in that category as qualifying for a point. But for an R3 development, we believe a pool has value. We are hoping that the pool could be considered for a point. Looking at Item 2 of Parks and Paths, there's a paragraph regarding points awarded for any amenity that will provide recreation. It further states that the Commission has the option to consider that amenity for an extra point, because it has recreational value. We are asking the commission to award a point for the pool.

Richard Liaw appeared on behalf of the project.

Liaw: The project's original design was for partial rental and partial ownership. We have been working with the City Attorney to resolve the situation. We have been looking at possible solutions. One idea is that instead of having a large block of rental units, there could be duplexes with ownership by one person and rental by another. It is just one idea that could be considered.

Tanda then turned the discussion over to the Commission.

Escobar: Regarding the points awarded by Planning Staff, is Burgos' suggestion in line with Planning Staff's intentions?

Tolentino: Pools were on the list but were removed this year. It is up to the Planning Commission to determine if the recreational value of the pool qualifies it for an additional point.

Koepp-Baker: To clarify, the applicant is asking for a point for a pool that is already committed to and was awarded points last year?

Tolentino: Yes.

Tanda: I'm confused about comments by Mr. Liaw. I heard him talking about single family units, but aren't we really focusing on rentals?

Tolentino: Yes.

Vince: The application was made on the balance of the project. There are some townhome units. If this project could receive future allotments for those, we could finish out the project. Tonight we are asking for 31 units.

Mueller: You applied for 100 percent rental last year.

Vince: No, the application was very specific. 100 units were rental. The

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 10

remaining 29 units were for sale.

Tanda: Why aren't the 31 units sought being considered under the on-going project category?

Vince: The criteria state that you have to acquire Final Map to be recognized as an ongoing project. That is impossible to do in the amount of time since last year's allotments were awarded. No projects that were awarded points last year could receive ongoing status yet because there wasn't time to file a Final Map.

Tolentino: The project is just being evaluated and scored as a rental project, since the project is competing in the 100% rental category.

Tanda: Is the owner asking for duplex status?

Escobar: They're not asking for that, they're just using it as an example of creative thinking for the remainder of the units.

Mueller: I'm having a problem with splitting the project into two types of housing. Townhouses don't count as rentals. How do you cross categories for housing types? Maybe we could revisit that issue.

Tolentino: Before moving on to the next item, Staff needs clarification regarding the pool.

Mueller: I think in this type of project, adding a pool in for points could be valuable.

Moniz: Would the pool be available for the entire development?

Tolentino: That could be stipulated in the development agreement. So is there consensus for a point value for pools?

The Planning Commissioners indicated a consensus that the commitment for a swimming pool be recognized as a four-point amenity, consistent with last year's application.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION FOR STAFF TO RE-EVALUATE THE PROJECT AMENITY CRITERION UNDER PARKS&PATHS]

Tanda closed the discussion and moved on to the 6th project.

f) MEASURE C,
MC-09-07:
SANTA TERESA-
GARCIA:

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 15-unit custom lot single family development is located on an 18 acre site on the south west quadrant of the intersection of Watsonville Rd. and Santa Teresa Blvd. (APN 779-02-023)

Tolentino presented her staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 11

Tanda opened the floor to speaker Roche Garcia.

Garcia: This is probably the lowest scoring project ever submitted in Measure C. I apologize for that. The home sizes will be in the range of 4,000 square feet and up. It is adjacent to the Quail Meadows project. It will be one of the first custom home subdivisions within the City in the last 10 years. It adds a value that the City sorely needs. And, as Koepp-Baker stated regarding wells, we actually have 3 wells on the site. We are working with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) on this project. This project will even take one of the irrigation wells and use purple pipe which would conserve water.

Burgos: One item that we have looked at is the Open Space category. Sometimes there is an odd dynamic, but item 1D page 12 relates specifically to usable open space. You might normally prefer not to have parks on 15-lot projects. But there are areas designated for vineyards and bicycle paths maintained by an HOA, and those should be awarded points. It will be a unique use and will connect bicycle paths. We feel the project does provide substantial, accessible easements and does conform to these criteria.

McClintock: We have submitted a letter (page 25) that addresses one of the Public Facility criteria regarding the detention pond being onsite or offsite. Staff is not allowing points, either because they didn't have letter, or because the calculation providing accuracy of the detention pond wasn't provided. This project is more in line with Note 2, where the applicant is using another pond on another development, so that would not require calculations and would not be a reason to disallow points.

Mueller: How do you know the pond would meet efficiency?

McClintock: We're going to make it bigger.

Mueller: Where do you show that?

McClintock: I guess I failed to show it, but we've done this on other projects such as the Pear Tree subdivision.

Mueller: Where is it in this submittal? It has to be on the plans or in the narrative.

McClintock: So we won't get that point.

Koepp-Baker: Will the pond have the efficiency, and if not, how much do you plan to increase it?

McClintock: Normally, those calculations are not done this soon. But we do have an agreement letter to use the neighboring subdivision's (Quail Meadows) pond. We will enlarge it and do the calculations necessary.

Koepp-Baker: You'll make those calculations available?

McClintock: Yes.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 08, 2009
PAGE 12

Mueller: The documentation would need to show that it is oversized or at least meets capacity.

McClintock: The criterion doesn't ask us to provide calculations on an existing pond.

Mueller: Staff has indicated those projections were not included in the submittal.

Garcia: There is a letter in the file.

Creer: There is a letter, but South Valley Developers doesn't own the lot that the detention pond is on. The letter would need to include approval from all homeowners.

Mueller: Let's deal with that issue later.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION FOR STAFF TO RE-EVALUATE CRITERION 2.d UNDER PUBLIC FACILITIES AND CRITERION 1.b UNDER OPEN SPACE]

With nothing further, Tanda moved on to the last project.

g) MEASURE C,
MC-09-08:
E. DUNNE-SO.
VALLEY
DEVELOPERS

A request for a Residential Development Control System building allocation for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. The proposed 50-unit multi-family development is located on a 4.2 acre site on the south east quadrant of the intersection of E. Dunne Ave. and Church St. (APN 817-01-056 & 057)

Tolentino presented her staff report.

Tanda opened the floor to Jim Schilling, who appeared on behalf of Scott Schilling of South Valley Developers.

Schilling: We would like to commend staff for their scoring.

Mueller: What is happening to Myrtle?

Creer: It is being vacated. It will be an access point for the project but will no longer be a public street. Right now that section of Myrtle Avenue is fenced approximately 50 feet to the east of Church Street and terminates at the UPRR tracks.

Mueller: I thought they were committing to make improvements on the section of Myrtle between Church and Monterey?

Creer: No.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 13

MEASURE C,
MC-09-06:
MONTEREY-
DYNASTY
(continued
discussion:)

Tanda: With no further questions, the discussion was moved back to the Monterey-Dynasty project regarding how to evaluate a project consisting of two different housing set-aside categories (e.g. rental and open market).

Mueller: I'm concerned with how they're asking us to treat Monterey-Dynasty. I have never seen a project be considered where it crossed housing types.

Tolentino: We have come across another project. It was scored as a micro-project for four additional units. The four units were evaluated as a stand-alone project. If we did that, you couldn't double count.

Mueller: They're asking us to score this as one project but let it compete in two categories. I don't know of any way possible for that to be done. If it's 100 percent rental, then everything has to be rental. How would you treat BMRs? You couldn't count a 2000 square foot BMR in the "extremely low" category. It would need to be in a higher category.

Koepp-Baker: It should be two different applications.

Liegl: Why couldn't you score it on a percentage?

Koepp-Baker: It would still need two applications.

Moniz: Is there precedence for this? It's probably not the first time or the last time this sort of thing has/will come up?

Tolentino: No.

Tanda: It's probably not relevant in scoring for this competition.

Koepp-Baker: It is relevant as far as precedence.

Mueller: Our impression was that this entire project was for rent.

Koepp-Baker: It was 68 units that were for rent.

Tolentino: We could check the records, but I believe they were asking for some owner units.

[THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE COMMISSION THAT FUTURE POLICY DISCUSSION IS NEEDED REGARDING HOW TO EVALUATE PROJECTS WITH MULTIPLE HOUSING SETASIDE CATEGORIES (E.G. RENTAL AND OPEN MARKET)]

Tanda: That concludes this item on the agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 08, 2009

PAGE 14

ANNOUNCEMENTS/ The December 19 Planning Commission meeting is canceled.
COMMISSIONER
IDENTIFIED ISSUES

CITY COUNCIL None.
REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT Noting that there was no further business for the Planning Commission at this meeting, Chair Tanda adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m. and wished everyone a Happy New Year.

MINUTES RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

ELIZABETH BASSETT
Development Services Technician

R:\PLANNING\WP51\MINUTES\PCminutes\2009\12-DECEMBER\Dec0809 Final PC Minutes.doc